

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

DANIEL KAPETAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES COX, *et al.*,

Defendants.

3:13-cv-00171-MMD-VPC

MINUTES OF THE COURT

August 24, 2015

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. COOKE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: LISA MANN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is defendants' motion to strike (#79) plaintiff's purported stipulation to add Rex Reed as a defendant (#74), and also plaintiff's motion for leave to add Rex Reed as a defendant (#88). Defendants opposed (#91) and plaintiff replied (#94).

The court may strike an improper filing under its "inherent power over the administration of its business." *Spurlock v. F.B.I.*, 69 F.3d 1010, 1016 (9th Cir. 1995). Defendants' motion to strike (#79) is **GRANTED**. As defendants explain in their motion, plaintiff did not secure their agreement to adding Rex Reed as a defendant. Thus, there is no valid stipulation. Docket no. 74 is hereby **STRICKEN**.

Plaintiff's motion for leave (#88) is **DENIED**. Plaintiff argues that, as a *pro se* party, he should be held to less stringent standards. Although true, plaintiff misinterprets the application of this rule. Although *Hanes v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972) and other cases require that he be held to a more minimal *pleading* standard, he is nevertheless expected to read, understand, and comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of Practice.

